

Amendments to the Drawings:

In paragraph 3, the Office objected to the drawings under 37 CFR §1.83(a). In particular, the Office requested that the vehicle body and vehicle axles claimed in claim 10 are shown.

In response, applicant submits new FIG. 3 showing the vehicle body and a vehicle axle. A short description of this Figure has also been inserted into the specification.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet with new FIG. 3

Remarks

Claims 1 to 11 are pending. Claim 1, 2, 6, 7, 10 and 11 are amended. Only claims 1, 2 and 10 are in independent form.

In paragraph 4, the Office objected to the disclosure for reciting "202" on page 1, line 11 of the specification.

In response, applicant has appropriately amended the disclosure.

In paragraph 5, the Office objected to the specification under 35 CFR §1.75(d)(1) as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the phrase "the pressure in at least one of the first and second pressurized medium spaces is greater than the maximum actual compression end pressure of said compressor" as recited in claim 6.

Applicant respectfully submits that this language is supported in the specification on page 8, lines 1 to 4.

In paragraph 6, the Office objected to claim 6 and requested that "then" in line 3 should be changed to "than."

In response, applicant has appropriately amended the claim.

In paragraph 7 and 8, the Office rejected claims 1 to 11 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office, in particular, rejected the phrase "said pressurized medium supply vessel" first claimed in line 11 of claim 1 (see also claim 10) as indefinite as the Office was unclear on whether applicant intended to refer to one of the pressurized medium supply vessels or generally to the pressurized

medium supply vessel means.

In response, applicant has amended claims 1 and 10 to clarify that reference is made to the pressurized medium supply vessel means.

The phrase "said pressurized air line" in lines 2 and 3 of claim 7 was rejected as it was considered unclear to what air line applicant referred.

In response, applicant has changed "said pressurized air line" to "a pressurized air line."

Different phrases in claims 7 and 11 were rejected for lack of antecedent basis.

These rejections were addressed appropriately.

In claim 11, clarification for the word "sequentially" was requested. Clarification for the phrase "transfer the pressurized medium into said air dryer when the first or the second medium space is not connected to said air dryer" was also requested.

Applicant has amended claim 11 to clarify the phrase "sequentially." Applicant has also amended the claim to clarify that the transfer into the air drier follows a loss of connection to only one of the medium spaces.

In paragraphs 9 and 10, claims 1, 4 to 7, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent 4,858,895 to Buma et al. (hereinafter "Buma").

Buma discloses an air suspension system having a compressed air supply and exhaust system 10, four suspensions (20, 22, 24, 26) as well as reserve systems 30 and 32, which include high and low pressure reserve tanks (33, 34; 33R; 34R). System 10 connects to supply pipe 40 via pipe 42 and to exhaust pipe 41 via pipe 43.

System 10 also contains a pump 3 having a suction port 1 and an exhaust port 2. The suction port 1 is open to the atmosphere through check valve 4. A flow control return valve 5 is provided in pipe 43. Air may be transferred to the air chambers (such as air chamber 50) from supply tank 33 via pressure valve 35 and supply pipe 40 and from the air chambers to the low reserve tank 34 via discharge valve 58 and exhaust pipe 41 (column 5, lines 54 to 63).

Claim 1 as amended requires:

"said first controllable directional valve being switchable to connect either said first pressurized medium space or, alternatively, said second pressurized medium space to either said compressor input or, alternatively, to said compressor output so that pressurized medium from said pressurized medium chambers can be either transferred into said first pressurized medium space or, alternatively, into said second pressurized medium space or pressurized medium can be transferred from either said first pressurized medium space or, alternatively from said second pressurized medium space to said pressurized medium chambers." (emphasis added)

Claim 10 as amended contains equivalent language.

Claim 1 as amended clarifies that a connection of the first pressure medium space or the second pressure medium space to either the compressor input or compressor output is strictly alternative. At no time can both medium spaces be simultaneously connected to the compressor. For example, the first pressure medium space can not be connected to the compressor input at a time the second pressure medium space is connected to the compressor output. Thus, the two medium spaces are not directly connected to each other at any given time and no position of the

first directional valve allows the two medium spaces to be in a direct connection. As a result and as emphasized in amended claim 11, any pressurizing medium is transferred sequentially, that is from, say, the first medium space (for example, via the compressor) to the air dryer and after the connection between the air dryer and the first medium space has been interrupted, the air dryer is connected to the second medium space, to, for example, transfer pressurized medium from the air dryer (for example, via the compressor) to the second medium space.

In contrast, Buma allows his high and low pressure reserve tanks (33, 34; 33R; 34R) to have contact with each other either directly or via the compressor (see, for example, last paragraph of claim 1). There is no indication anywhere in Buma of a configuration that excludes a connection between the reserve tanks at any given time as set forth by applicant's claim 1.

In addition, Buma's reserve tanks do not have an equivalent to the "first directional valve." This first direct valve is common to the two medium spaces of applicant's invention and thus allows only one of them to connect to either the compressor or the medium chambers at a given time.

Buma's valve 5, which the Office considers to be equivalent to applicant's first directional valve, is located in exhaust pipe 43, which is, via bypass line 12, also connected to supply pipe 42. The low pressure reserve tank 34 is connected to exhaust pipe 43 via pipe 41. The high pressure reserve tank 33 is connected to supply pipe 42 via supply pipe 40. While Buma does not describe the function of valve 5 in any detail, the location of valve 5 as shown in Buma's FIG. 1 indicates that valve 5 is only involved in

the control of exhaust air. Nowhere in Buma can an indication be found that valve 5 might have the functions of the first directional valve of applicant's amended claim 1 (see emphasis above).

Accordingly, applicant has shown above that Buma does not disclose all of the elements of the claimed invention as required for an anticipation rejection.

In paragraphs 11 and 12, claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Buma in view of United States Patent 4,015,859 to Hegel et al (hereinafter "Hegel").

The deficiencies of Buma have been outlined above. Applicant submits that Hegel does not cure these deficiencies. In particular, applicant submits that Buma and Hegel, when combined, do not teach or suggest all the limitations of claim 8 as required for a prima facie case of obviousness (MPEP §2142). Applicant further submits that there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the Buma or Hegel or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to combine the teachings of Buma or Hegel to arrive at the claimed invention. Finally, applicant submits that there is no reasonable expectation of success.

In paragraph 13, the Office stated that claims 2, 3 and 9 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants have addressed the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in the Office Action and amended claim 2 into

independent form. Accordingly, this claim should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 3 and 9, which are dependent on claim 2, should also be in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter Ottesen  
Reg. No. 25,544

Walter Ottesen  
Patent Attorney  
P.O. Box 4026  
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20885-4026

Phone: (301) 869-8950

Date: February 7, 2005